

REMARKS

Claims 6-8, 20-21, and 43-45 have been previously cancelled. Claims 1, 17, 24, 32, 35, and 38 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claim 54 is new. Claims 1-5, 9-19, 22-42, and 46-54 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 6, 17, 24, 28, 32, 35, 38, 42, and 43 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman et. al. (US 6141693) in view of Horne (US 5473379) and further in view of Wilcox et. al. (US 6072542). The rejection is respectfully traversed. Perlman teaches combining digital information with a video stream and using the digital information to modify or augment video frames in the video stream. Horne teaches block-based motion compensation using the global motion of a video frame. Wilcox teaches detection of video shot boundaries using a video segmenting hidden Markov model to model the sequence states of a video. Neither Perlman, Horne, nor Wilcox recite “providing the processed motion information to the client, wherein providing the processed motion information allows the client to identify video information in the bit stream; and receiving a selection of a location in the bit stream from the client” as is recited in claims in the independent claims 1, 17, 24, 32, 35, and 38 as amended. It is therefore believed that the independent claims 1, 17, 24, 32, 35, and 38 are allowable. Also, claims 2-5, 9-16, 18-19, 22-23, 25-31, 33-34, 36-37, 39-42, and 46-53 depend from these independent claims and so are believed to be allowable as well.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 18, 25, 33, 36, and 39 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman et. al. (US 6141693) in view of Horne (US 5473379) and further in view of Kuhn et. al. (US 6297845). The rejection is respectfully traversed. Perlman’s and Horne’s teachings are noted in the paragraph above. Kuhn teaches a switched digital video broadcast network providing in-service testing of digitized broadcast video signals subject to analog-to-digital and digital-to-analog conversion. Neither Perlman, Horne, nor Kuhn recite “providing the processed motion information to the client, wherein providing the processed motion information allows the client to identify video information in the bit stream; and receiving a selection of a location in the bit stream from the client” as is recited in claims in the independent claims 1, 17, 24, 32, 35, and 38 as amended. It is therefore believed that the independent claims 1, 17, 24, 32, 35, and 38 are allowable. Also, claims 2-5, 9-16, 18-19, 22-23,

25-31, 33-34, 36-37, 39-42, and 46-53 depend from these independent claims and so are believed to be allowable as well.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 19, 26, 34, 37, and 40 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman et. al. (US 6141693) in view of Horne (US 5473379) in view of Wilcox et. al. (US 6072542) and further in view of Yim (US 6452969).

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 27, and 41 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman et. al. (US 6141693) in view of Horne (US 5473379) in view of Wilcox et. al. (US 6072542) and further in view of Richmond (US 5805156).

The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 10, 22, 23, 46, and 47 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman et. al. (US 6141693) in view of Horne (US 5473379) in view of Wilcox et. al. (US 6072542) and further in view of Etoh (US 6081551).

The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 12, 30, 48, and 49 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman et. al. (US 6141693) in view of Horne (US 5473379) in view of Wilcox et. al. (US 6072542) and further in view of Rao (US 6041142).

The Examiner has rejected claims 13, 14, 29, 50, and 51 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman et. al. (US 6141693) in view of Horne (US 5473379) in view of Wilcox et. al. (US 6072542) and further in view of Wang (US 6212657).

The rejections are respectfully traversed. Perlman's, Horne's, and Wilcox's teachings are noted in a paragraph above. Yim teaches a video editing system for editing a compressed video stream in the transform domain reconstructs frames of video signal that have been motion compensated predictive encoded on a block basis. Richmond teaches a capture device that permits selecting portions of a media stream encoded with associated data based on specified event data that is embedded in the data stream. Etoh teaches an image encoding and decoding apparatus that does not limit the reference image to a particular frame. Rao teaches a video data stream analyzer that modifies an input digital video signal so that the resulting output digital signal can be optimally compressed by a digital video encoder. Wang teaches a video server that has a modular and expandable system designed to deliver a plurality of video streams on user demand and under user control.

Neither Perlman, Horne, Wilcox, Yim, Richmond, Etoh, Rao, nor Wang recite “providing the processed motion information to the client, wherein providing the processed motion information allows the client to identify video information in the bit stream; and receiving a selection of a location in the bit stream from the client” as is recited in claims in the independent claims 1, 17, 24, 32, 35, and 38 as amended. It is therefore believed that the independent claims 1, 17, 24, 32, 35, and 38 are allowable. Also, claims 2-5, 9-16, 18-19, 22-23, 25-31, 33-34, 36-37, 39-42, and 46-53 depend from these independent claims and so are believed to be allowable as well.

A new claim 54 was added. Since the independent claims 1, 17, 24, 32, 35, and 38 were amended to include “receiving a selection of a location in the bit stream,” claim 54 was added to include the notion of “receiving a selection … of a compressed bit stream from among the plurality of compressed video bit streams.”

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/13/06

Xa 
Laura Ing
Registration No. 56,859
V 408-973-2578
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014